United Nations A/61/994–S/2007/418

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
9 July 2007

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-first session
Agenda item 19
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Sixty-second year

Letter dated 6 July 2007 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 6 July 2007 addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Kemal Gökeri, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 19, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Baki İlkin
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

07-41997 (E) 160707

Annex to the letter dated 6 July 2007 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to refer to the letter dated 15 May 2007 addressed to you by the Greek Cypriot representative and circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council (A/61/913-S/2007/288). In the face of gross misrepresentations and distortions contained in that letter, I feel compelled to set the record straight.

The Greek Cypriot representative, in his letter, is trying to portray the Cyprus question as one of "invasion" and "occupation" by Turkey, in an attempt to absolve the Greek Cypriot side from its grave responsibility in the creation and the continuation of the dispute. At this point, it should be underlined that none of the Security Council resolutions on Cyprus, including the ones mentioned in the letter, refer to the legitimate Turkish intervention in Cyprus as "invasion" and "occupation". Furthermore, his claim also begs the question as to why the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) was deployed to the island in 1964, 10 years before the Turkish intervention in 1974. The answer would be to stop the mass murder of the Turkish Cypriots by the Greek Cypriot militia. This period is a deep scar in the history of Cyprus, to which the Greek Cypriot representatives continuously and conveniently fail to make any single reference.

It is a well-documented fact that unlike the Greek Cypriot false assertion, the Cyprus question did not arise overnight on 20 July 1974, but is the result of a long history of events perpetuated by the Greek Cypriots in order to annex the island to Greece (enosis). Following the destruction, in December 1963, of the 1960 Republic of Cyprus and the ejection, by force of arms, of the Turkish Cypriots from the partnership government, the Turkish Cypriot people endured the agonies and losses caused by the Greek Cypriot armed attacks, were confined to small enclaves and subjected to gross human rights violations for 11 years. Thousands of Turkish Cypriot civilians lost their lives, were maimed or wounded and hundreds more went missing under the 11-year Greek Cypriot oppression.

It is, in fact, true that there is an occupation in Cyprus, but this is the 44-year-old usurpation and continued occupation of the seat of government of the partnership Republic of Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot side. The Turkish intervention in Cyprus, carried out in accordance with its rights and obligations emanating from the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, was fully legal and legitimate under the said Treaty. Turkish troops are in Cyprus under legal obligation to keep peace pending a solution and the Turkish military presence on the island is a vital security requirement for the Turkish Cypriot people, particularly in the absence of a comprehensive settlement. The Greek Cypriot representative conveniently chose to overlook the fact that it was the Greek Cypriots who rejected the United Nations Comprehensive Settlement Plan (also known as the Annan plan) which had, inter alia, effectively addressed this issue.

Furthermore, contrary to the Greek Cypriot representative's ridiculous assertion, it is a well-documented fact that the Turkish policy on Cyprus has always been in favour of a fair settlement through negotiations, under the auspices of the United Nations. As also recorded by your predecessor (S/2004/437), Turkey has been more than forthcoming in not only cooperating to develop a solution in

Cyprus, but also in strongly encouraging the Turkish Cypriot side to opt for the approval of the Comprehensive Settlement Plan, which was described again by your predecessor as the only choice as opposed to no settlement.

I want to put on record, once again, that the rejection of the Comprehensive Settlement Plan by 76 per cent at the Greek Cypriot referendum demonstrated that the Greek Cypriot leadership is not and has never been ready to enter into a power-sharing arrangement with the Turkish Cypriots. Instead, it chooses to continue to enjoy the benefits of the usurped title of the "Republic of Cyprus" and its unilateral European Union membership.

It is a well-known fact that the Annan plan was the result of four and a half years of negotiations and that it evolved on the basis of the settlement parameters that have come about in almost four decades of negotiations. Referring to the plan, which enjoyed the open support of the international community in its entirety, as "a flawed plan" is an insult to the good-willed efforts of all who contributed to this painstaking effort to help bring about a comprehensive settlement to the Cyprus problem.

At this point, I also would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Greek Cypriot representatives, who are very keen on making references to Security Council resolutions, particularly to 186 (1964), 541 (1983) and 550 (1984), which are respectively 43, 24 and 23 years old, conveniently and consistently refrain from referring to more recent Council resolutions, such as resolution 1475 (2003), in which the Council stated that it fully supports the "carefully balanced plan of 26 February 2003 as a unique basis for further negotiations, and calls on all concerned to negotiate within the framework of the Secretary-General's Good Offices, using the plan to reach a comprehensive settlement as set forth in paragraphs 144-151 of the Secretary-General's report". It is all the more interesting and meaningful to discover that in the book published by the "Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Cyprus" in 2006, which contains "all" Security Council resolutions on Cyprus, one resolution was somehow left out and this happened to be 1475 (2003). Apparently, they do not believe in the virtue of intellectual honesty.

The reference to the free will of the Turkish Cypriot people, expressed in the referendum as a "risk free" and "tactically guided vote" is, to say the least, provocative and disrespectful. As to this allegation, first of all, I would like to quote the Spokesman of the Secretary-General on the outcome of the referendums in Cyprus (S/2004/437, see annex III).

> "*The Secretary-General applauds the Turkish Cypriots, who approved the plan notwithstanding the significant sacrifices that it entailed for many of them. He regrets that the Turkish Cypriots will not equally enjoy the benefits of EU membership as of 1 May 2004, but he hopes that ways will be found to ease the plight in which the people find themselves through no fault of their own.*
>
> *Together with a broad cross-section of the international community, the Secretary-General remains convinced that the settlement plan put to the two sides in today's referenda represents a fair, viable and carefully balanced compromise — one that conforms with the long-agreed parameters for a solution and with the Security Council's vision for a settlement, and meets the minimum requirements of all concerned.*"

Furthermore, the fact which took the Turkish Cypriot people to the streets many times in tens of thousands in 2003 and 2004 and brought about a leadership, government, and as a result, policy change in favour of a settlement, stands witness to the sincerity of the hard-earned Turkish Cypriot "yes" vote. The Greek Cypriot leadership, who demands respect for the Greek Cypriot "no" vote on the Annan plan, which indeed prevented the settlement, is naturally expected to show at least the same respect for the Turkish Cypriot "yes" vote. Otherwise, one might suggest that it was indeed the Greek Cypriot "no" vote that was "risk free" and "tactically guided" as the Greek Cypriot leader Mr. Papadopoulos made abundantly clear in his televised address to the Greek Cypriot people on 7 April 2004, when he demanded a "resounding no" to the Annan plan from the Greek Cypriots on the eve of the referendum. In his address, he stated, inter alia, that "Logically, the following question is asked: What will be the consequences if the people (Greek Cypriots) vote no at the referendum? If the sovereign people with their vote reject the plan, within a week the Republic of Cyprus will become a full and equal EU member. We will achieve a strategic goal that we have jointly set to upgrade and politically armour the Republic of Cyprus. This target will be achieved".

As to the Greek Cypriot representative's rhetoric on resolution 186 (1964), 541 (1983), and 550 (1984), I would like to state that we support and share the views conveyed by the Permanent Representative of Turkey, in his letter addressed to you dated 27 April 2007 and circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council (A/61/885-S/2007/246).

As for the allegation regarding the remarks of President Talat in an interview given to Bayrak television on 1 May 2007, it is regrettable that in a lengthy interview the sentences of the President were carefully hand-picked in a manner distorting the main thrust of the interview. The efforts of the Greek Cypriot leadership to portray President Talat as a leader opposed to a solution are not new. The aim here obviously is to dent President Talat's well-established reputation as the pro-solution leader in the island, who courageously supported the Annan plan and managed to secure an overwhelming "yes" vote from the Turkish Cypriot people against all odds. The Greek Cypriot leader, Papadopoulos, on the other hand is known for his maximalist and uncompromising policies vis-à-vis the Cyprus problem as corroborated by his stance during the referendums on the Annan plan and the policies he pursued thereafter. Naturally, such ill-conceived and ill-founded efforts should not be expected to change the internationally well-known reality as to which leader is for a settlement in the island and which is against.

The Turkish Cypriot side, for its part, has certainly proved its dedication to resolve the Cyprus problem on the basis of a new partnership, political equality and power sharing, and our firm conviction in this regard remains unchanged. As for the Greek Cypriot side, if it truly desires such a settlement, it is high time that this is expressed not only in words but also in concrete actions.

It is dismaying that the Greek Cypriot leadership continues to deny even the existence of the isolations imposed upon the Turkish Cypriot people and refer to them as a "myth", at a time when it is expected to stop blocking international efforts towards lifting the isolations. In this context, the Greek Cypriot representative should be reminded of your predecessor's report dated 28 May 2004, the decision taken by the European Council on 26 April 2004, subsequent European Parliament resolutions, the Council of Europe resolution dated 29 April 2004 and many

statements made by foreign dignitaries, all calling for the lifting of the isolations on the Turkish Cypriot people. Moreover, in your latest report on UNFICYP dated 4 June 2007, you stated that you stand by the report of your predecessor and referred to the issue of lifting the isolations. It is ironic that on the issue of lifting the isolations upon the Turkish Cypriot people, the Greek Cypriot leadership, who claims that this is a myth and attempts to block every attempt in this direction, is the one who in this respect is "isolated" from the rest of the international community.

I would like to reiterate our firm commitment for the comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem without further delay under your good offices mission and on the basis of the United Nations Settlement Plan.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 19, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) M. Kemal **Gökeri**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus